UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,399	09/23/2003	Yen Lu	CA920020042US1	4350

7590 10/18/2005

Marilyn S. Dawkins
International Business Machines,
Intellectual Property Law
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER	
HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/668,399	LU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kristina B. Honeycutt	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 September 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15 and 18-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15 and 18-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/23/03*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed September 23, 2003 with acknowledged foreign priority date December 6, 2002; Preliminary Amendment filed September 23, 2003; Information Disclosure Statement filed September 23, 2003.

This action is made **Non-Final**.

2. Claims 1-15, 18-26 are pending in the case. Claims 16 and 17 were cancelled in the preliminary amendment. Claims 1, 10, 18 and 20 are independent claims.

Priority

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 10668399, filed on September 23, 2003.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) was submitted on September 23, 2003. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

5. The drawings filed on September 23, 2003 are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claim 15 recites the limitation "the returned script" in lines 3-4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent

granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10, 11, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ries et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20040217985; publication date November 4, 2004; filed July 1, 2002; provisional application filed June 29, 2001).

Regarding independent claim 1, Ries discloses a method for creating a web page adapted to automatically reload selected frames of the web page in response to a trigger event, the method comprising:

- defining a target frame for the web page to serve as a work area (p.4, para. 56; p.6, para. 70 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a target frame is defined as a work area since Ries teaches a content frame for presenting web pages for interacting, browsing, viewing and editing);
- associating an action with the trigger event, the action having the target frame as a target (Fig. 6; p.4, para. 56; p.5, para. 58; p.7, para. 79; p.8, para. 80, 83 – as demonstrated in the figure and cited text, actions are associated with triggers since Ries teaches editing and saving web pages in the content frame and actions occurring as a result of the edit and save triggers); and
- associating programmed logic with the action, the programmed logic being adapted to reload only the selected frames, regardless of a membership of the selected frames in framesets used to create the web page (Fig. 6; p.5, para. 57-

59; p.8, para. 80, 83 – as demonstrated in the figure and cited text, logic is associated with the actions that reloads the selected frames since Ries teaches reloading the content frame when the edit and save triggers occur).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Ries discloses a method as claimed in claim 1 wherein:

- defining the target frame comprises defining a named frame with a static source in a frameset of the web page (p.4, para. 49, 55, 56 – as demonstrated in the cited text, the target frame comprises a named frame with a static source since Ries teaches a content frame as the target and static sources for the files and web pages).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Ries discloses a method as claimed in claim 1 further comprising:

- associating the action with programmed logic for reloading only the selected frames of the web page in dependence on a predefined set of conditions (Fig. 6; p.5, para. 57-59; p.8, para. 80, 83 – as demonstrated in the figure and cited text, logic is associated with the actions that reloads the selected frames in dependence of other conditions since Ries teaches reloading the content frame when the edit and save triggers occur).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Ries discloses a method as claimed in claim 1 further comprising:

- accessing server-side functions in dependence on a predefined set of conditions (p.4, para. 50; p.5, para. 59 – as demonstrated in the cited text, server side functions are accessed in dependence of other conditions since Ries teaches backend logic residing on a server).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Ries discloses a method as claimed in claim 7 further comprising:

- providing a link to a dynamic uniform resource locator (p.8, para. 82; p.9, para. 88 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a link to a URL is provided).

Regarding claims 10 and 11, the claims reflect the web page for performing the operations of claims 1 and 2 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 18, Ries discloses an article comprising:

- a computer readable modulated carrier signal (p.4, para. 50, 53 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Ries teaches a computer and a network for requesting and receiving web pages and performing the operations of the invention so a signal would be present in the article); and
- means embedded in the signal for communicating to a client computer, a message containing:
    - rendering information in response to a request for a server-side processing (p.4, para. 50, 56; p.5, para. 59 – as demonstrated in the cited

text, rendering and server side processing occur since Ries teaches rendering web pages and backend logic residing on a server); and

- client side code for reloading only selected frames of a web page, regardless of a frameset which the respective frames are members (Fig. 6; p.5, para. 57-59; p.8, para. 80, 83 – as demonstrated in the figure and cited text, the selected frames are reloaded at the client since Ries teaches reloading the content frame at the client's computer when the edit and save triggers occur).

Regarding independent claim 20, the claim reflects the computer readable medium for performing the operations of claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 3-5, 12-15, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ries in view of Westerman (U.S. Patent 6683986; date of patent January 27, 2004; filed October 28, 1999).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Ries does not disclose defining the named frame comprises defining the target frame as a frame having a null dimension. Westerman teaches a null frame (col. 8, lines 22-24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ries and Westerman before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the frame taught by Ries to include a frame with a null dimension as taught by Westerman, because including a frame with a null dimension, as taught by Westerman (col. 8, lines 22-24), would distinguish the target frame from other frames.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Ries does not disclose defining the named frame comprises defining a frame of 0 rows and 0 columns at an edge of the web page. Westerman teaches frames with rows and columns (col. 5, lines 8-11) so it would have been obvious that the frame could contain zero rows and zero columns. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ries and Westerman before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the frame taught by Ries to include a frame 0 rows and 0 columns as taught by Westerman, because including a frame with 0 rows and columns, as taught by Westerman (col. 5, lines 8-11), would distinguish the target frame from other frames.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Ries does not disclose defining the frame further comprises using a first frameset tag in the web page to partition the web page into a

main frameset comprising a plurality of frames, and the target frame having the null dimension. Westerman teaches partitioning a frame into a plurality of frames and a frame with a null dimension (col. 5, lines 8-11; col. 8, lines 22-24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ries and Westerman before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the frame taught by Ries to include partitioning frames and a frame with a null dimension as taught by Westerman, because partitioning frames and a frame with a null dimension, as taught by Westerman (col. 5, lines 8-11; col. 8, lines 22-24), would distinguish the target frame from other frames and would allow users to divide frames for various purposes.

Regarding dependent claims 12 and 13, the claims reflect the web page for performing the operations of claims 3 and 4 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Ries discloses the trigger comprises one of a link and a form that has the script as an action attribute and the target frame as a target attribute (p.4, para. 56; p.5, para. 57, 58; p.6, para. 69, 70; p.7, para. 79).

Regarding dependent claim 15, Ries discloses the action attribute comprises a uniform resource locator (url) of a dynamic web page that includes the script and effects the downloading of the dynamic web page to the target frame, and the returned script with rendering information provides a set of instructions that include instructions for

reloading only the respective selected frames, regardless of respective membership of the selected frames in framesets of the web page (Fig. 6; p.4, para. 56; p.5, para. 57, 58, 59; p.6, para. 70; p.8, para. 80, 83).

Regarding dependent claim 19, the claim reflects the article for performing the operations of claim 3 and is rejected along the same rationale.

10. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ries in view of Woodard et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20020104080; publication date August 1, 2002; filed May 10, 2001; provisional application filed March 29, 2000).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Ries does not disclose providing the link comprises providing a dynamic server page link. Woodard teaches linking to a dynamic server page (p.4, para. 55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ries and Woodard before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the link taught by Ries to include a dynamic server page as taught by Woodard, because linking to a dynamic server page, as taught by Woodard (p.4, para. 55), would allow easy access to the dynamic server page.

11. Claims 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ries in view of Barrick et al. (U.S. Patent 6625647; date of patent September 23, 2003; filed October 19, 1999; continuation of application filed June 3, 1997).

Regarding dependent claim 21, Ries does not disclose the instructions for instantiating comprise a file written in HTML that comprises a plurality of frameset definitions, including a definition of the target frame. Barrick teaches an HTML file comprising frame definitions (col. 7, lines 44-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ries and Barrick before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the instructions taught by Ries to include an HTML file with frame definitions as taught by Barrick, because including an HTML file with frame definitions, as taught by Barrick (col. 7, lines 44-50), would allow easy access to the definitions through browsers or other applications.

Regarding dependent claims 22 and 25, the claims reflect the computer readable medium for performing the operations of claims 1 and 2 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Ries discloses the action is an attribute of one of the link and a form, and the event is a corresponding one of a selection of the link, and a submission of the form (p.7, para. 78).

Regarding dependent claim 24, Ries discloses the one of the link and the form has a target attribute set to the target frame (p.7, para. 78, 79; p.8, para. 79).

12. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ries in view of Barrick in further view of Westerman.

Regarding dependent claim 26, the claim reflects the computer readable medium for performing the operations of claim 3 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Method and system for automatic invocation of secure sockets layer encryption on a parallel array of web servers (U.S. Pub. No. 20020188862),
- System and method for generating video frames and correcting motion (U.S. Pub. No. 20040208246).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBH

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER